



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,078	04/04/2005	Jamila Najib	BJS-3665-126	9205
23117 7590 06/27/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
ZAREK, PAUL E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4161				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/520,078

**Applicant(s)**

NAJIB ET AL.

**Examiner**

PAUL ZAREK

**Art Unit**

4161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 38-68 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Restriction*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 06/05/2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the prior art does not contain all of the limitations of Claim 38 or 39. Specifically, Formula 5a (taught in French, et al., J Heterocyclic Chem, 1998) lacked either group 1 or 2. Therefore, the claimed inventions maintain a single general inventive concept. After careful consideration, the Examiner finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive and removes the restriction of 05/05/2008. However, a new restriction is required.

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 38-43, 46-65, and 67, drawn to a composition of Formula I or Formula II, wherein  $X_2$  is bound to carbon 3 of the propene chain.

Group II, claim(s) 38-60 and 63-67, drawn to a composition comprising Formula I or Formula II, wherein  $X_2$  is not bound to carbon 3 of the propene chain.

Group III, claim(s) 68, drawn to a method of treating and/or preventing various pathologies with a composition comprising a derivative of Formula I or Formula II.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the prior art teaches an embodiment of Formula I. Vanstone, et al (US Patent 4,190,671, 1980), discloses 4'-carboxymethoxy-4-sulphochalcone (Example 22, col 16, line 19). The disclosed compound reads on Formula I, wherein:

Art Unit: 4161

$X_1 = -G_1-R_1$  wherein  $G_1$  is O and  $R_1$  is  $CH_2COOR_6$  (group 1), wherein  $R_6$  is H

$X_2 = -H$

$X_3 = R_3$ , wherein  $R_3$  is H

$X_4 = -SO_3H$

$X_5 = -H$

The compound claimed in Vanstone, et al., contains all the limitations of Formula I. The instant application no longer maintains a special technical feature and unity of invention is broken.

### *Election of Species*

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If the Applicant elects Group I, the Applicant is requested to elect a single species of Formula I or II, wherein the following groups are specified:

- $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5$  and  $X_6$ 
  - a specification of the X groups requires specifying all subsequent R and G groups.

If the Applicant elects Group II, the Applicant is requested to elect a single species of Formula I or II, wherein the following groups are specified:

- $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5$  and  $X_6$ 
  - a specification of the X groups requires specifying all subsequent R and G groups.

If the Applicant elects Group III, the Applicant is requested to elect a single species of Formula I or II, wherein the following groups are specified:

- $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ,  $X_3$ ,  $X_4$ ,  $X_5$  and  $X_6$ 
  - a specification of the X groups requires specifying all subsequent R and G groups.
- the pathology to be treated and/or prevented

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Group I: 40-42, 46-65, and 67

Group II: 40-60, 63-67

Group III: none

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group I: Claim 38 or 39

Group II: Claim 38 or 39

Group III: Claim 68

5. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special

Art Unit: 4161

technical features for the following reasons: the prior art teaches an embodiment of Formula I. Vanstone, et al (US Patent 4,190,671, 1980), discloses 4'-carboxymethoxy-4-sulphochalcone (Example 22, col 16, line 19). The disclosed compound reads on Formula I, wherein:

X1 = -G1-R1 wherein G1 is O and R1 is CH<sub>2</sub>COOR<sub>6</sub> (group 1), wherein R<sub>6</sub> is H

X2 = -H

X3 = R<sub>3</sub>, wherein R<sub>3</sub> is H

X4 = -SO<sub>3</sub>H

X5 = -H

The compound claimed in Vanstone, et al., contains all the limitations of Formula I. The instant application no longer maintains a special technical feature and unity of invention is broken.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected

process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL ZAREK whose telephone number is (571)270-5754. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, PATRICK NOLAN can be reached on 571-272-0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PEZ

/Patrick J. Nolan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4161